

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 remain in the present application. Claims 1 and 9 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added as a result of the Claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the amendments and arguments set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being rendered obvious by Applicants' Figure 1 (hereafter referred to as "AAPA") in view of United States Patent Number 5,838,309 to Robsky et al. (hereafter referred to as "Robsky"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-20 are not rendered obvious by AAPA in view of Robsky for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites an integrated enclosure/touch screen assembly comprising (emphasis added):

a display mechanism;
a digitizer mechanism comprising a top film and a resistive digitizing element; and
a single piece cover enclosure for said touch screen assembly that is disposed over and encloses the top and sides of said touch screen assembly and that is coupled to said top film to operate therewith as a single physical layer to allow mechanical transfer between said single piece cover and said digitizer mechanism, wherein said resistive digitizing element can be activated by mechanical pressure applied to the external surface of said single piece cover enclosure, and wherein said single piece cover enclosure forms a seal to protect said digitizer mechanism.

Independent Claim 9 recites limitations similar to independent Claim 1. Claims 2-8 and 10-15 depend from independent Claims 1 and 9 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully assert that AAPA fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said single piece cover enclosure forms a seal to protect said digitizer mechanism” as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, a single-piece cover enclosure forms a seal to protect a digitizer mechanism from dust, dirt, moisture, etc.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants respectfully assert that AAPA teaches a multi-piece cover that fails to provide a seal. Specifically, prior art Figure 1 teaches a multi-part cover comprising supporting structure 105 and outermost protective film 110. Further, the present application states that such a bezel-design (characterized by step-down corner 150) “does not provide a satisfactory moisture and dust proof enclosure” (page 2, lines 13-18 and 20-21). As such, AAPA teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching a *multi-piece cover that fails to provide a seal* instead of a single-piece cover providing a seal as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that that Robsky, either alone or in combination with AAPA, also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said single piece cover enclosure forms a seal to protect said digitizer mechanism” as recited in independent Claim 1. In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Robsky to teach a digitizer mechanism which is not sealed. For example, Robsky teaches that the unsealed digitizer mechanism includes a membrane (e.g., element 24c of Figure 9 of Robsky) that

contacts a conductive surface (e.g., element 18c of Figure 9 of Robsky), similar to the top film and resistive digitizing element of the claimed digitizer mechanism. However, Robsky fails to teach a single-piece cover that seals the digitizer mechanism as claimed.

Furthermore, Robsky teaches a self-tensioning membrane (Abstract) which is self-tensioned in response to expansion and contraction of the membrane from exposure to the environment (e.g., humidity and moisture) (col. 1, lines 19-22; col. 4, lines 32-39). As such, the membrane is unsealed. Thus, Robsky teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching a digitizer mechanism that is unsealed instead of a sealed digitizer mechanism as claimed.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 16 that recites a display assembly for a portable electronic device comprising (emphasis added):

a flat panel display screen;
flat panel, clear, resistive digitizer mechanism disposed over said flat panel display screen; and
a bezel-less cover film disposed over a top surface of said digitizer mechanism and enclosing the top and sides of said display assembly and said digitizer mechanism wherein said cover film and said top surface are coupled to form a single mechanical structure and wherein mechanical deflection of said cover film can be used to activate said digitizer mechanism.

Claims 17-20 depend from independent Claim 16 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully assert that AAPA fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “a bezel-less cover film” as recited in independent Claim 16. As discussed above, Figure 1 shows a cover film with a bezel, where the bezel is indicated by step-down corners 150. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that

AAPA teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching a cover film with a bezel instead of a bezel-less cover film as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that that Robsky, either alone or in combination with AAPA, also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “a bezel-less cover film” as recited in independent Claim 16. In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants respectfully assert that while Robsky may teach a membrane as part of a digitizer mechanism, Robsky fails to teach a cover film as discussed above. Furthermore, Figure 8 of Robsky clearly shows a bezel (labeled element 20b) protruding above the surface of the membrane, which creates step-downs (not labeled in Figure 8 of Robsky) indicative of a bezel. As such, Robsky teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching a digitizer mechanism without a cover film and with a bezel instead of a bezel-less cover film as claimed.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claims 1, 9 and 16 are not rendered obvious by AAPA in view of Robsky, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since Claims 2-8, 10-15 and 17-20 depend from and recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 2-8, 10-15 and 17-20 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Therefore, Claims 1-20 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 9/8, 2006

BMF

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060